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***NOTES FOR COMPLETING THE REPORT:***

* *Avoid acronyms and UN jargon, use general / common language.*
* *Be as concrete as possible. Avoid theoretical, vague or conceptual discourse.*
* *Ensure the analysis and project progress assessment is gender and age sensitive.*

**PART 1: RESULTS PROGRESS**

* 1. **Overall project progress to date**

Briefly explain the **status of the project** in terms of its implementation cycle, including whether all preliminary/preparatory activities have been completed (1500 character limit):

In-country activities in KG and TJ are implemented since 2018. All non-infrastructure activities were either finalized by 30 October (including work with youth, women, ombudsperson institution, water associations), or will be finalized by end November 2019.

UNICEF and UN women TJ have completed their activities within the project.

Kyrgyzstan government (Steering Committee) has approved the list of equipment and infrastructure initiatives on 5 November 2019. In Tajikistan the list of equipment and low risk infrastructure under Output 1.2 of UNDP was agreed with local authorities in April 2018. Activities under Output 1.2. were put on hold until approval by government counterpart. WFP KG and TJ completed short-term vocational training programs on agricultural and practical skills for unemployed and unskilled young women and men. WFP KG is close to finalize the community assets rehabilitation projects. FAO TJ has nearly completed its work on pastures and building capacity of water-users association (all will be finalized in a grace period until end November 2019). FAO KG is close to finalization of drop irrigation and water flow measuring initiatives. UN Women KG implemented and finalized its activities as per the plan.

Given the recent/current political/peacebuilding/ transition situation/ needs in the country, has the project been/ does it continue to be **relevant** and well placed to address potential conflict factors/ sources of tensions/ risks to country’s sustaining peace progress? Please illustrate. If project is still ongoing, are any adjustments required? (1500 character limit)

The project is very relevant. Situation in border areas of KG and TJ remains tense. Two severe conflict incidents took place in reported period (July and September 2019). The September incident involved military personnel and led to 4 people killed. Overall 59 conflict incidents were registered between January 2018-November 2019. 83% of clashes are related to land disputes (including road disputes).

As most conflict incidents take place around natural resources (aggravated by mistrust), the project is well placed to mitigate some risks around natural resources distribution (water, pastures) and to bring people (especially young people and women) from both countries in joint actions to build confidence. The project works at community level, without contributing to the political processes of delimitation, since governments - so far - have not expressed interest in UN's involvement into the process.

In a few sentences, summarize **what is unique/ innovative/ interesting** about what this project is trying/ has tried to achieve or its approach (rather than listing activity progress) (1500 character limit).

The cross-border project is unique due to the approaches used, such as: conflict sensitive and bottom-up approach ensuring involvement of border residents and authorities in project implementation; providing a platform for dialogue to prevent rumors and misinterpretation and promote understanding and cooperation; addressing root causes (water, lack of social infrastructure, and education, border crossing etc.) and multiple stakeholders involvement (youth, women, water users, duty bearers etc.); consolidating efforts of five UN agencies on each side of the border; ensuring Governments' ownership and involvement.

The new approach UPSHIFT has been used within this project that gives essential peacebuilding competencies to young people to analyze the situation of their communities and look for innovative ideas to solve problems at local level with involvement of duty-bearers.

Considering the project’s implementation cycle, please **rate this project’s overall progress towards results to date**:

In a few sentences summarize **major project peacebuilding progress/results** (with evidence), which PBSO can use in public communications to highlight the project (1500 character limit):

The project addressed key risks by supporting pasture management, water resources management (by improving operation of water users associations), enabling improvement of people-friendly border services (through complaints system). Importantly, the project changes the ways local authorities undertake actions in border areas, and changes way of thinking about neighbours (and conflict) among people, especially among youth and women. Midline survey in 2018 showed that only 5.6% expect worsening of situation in border areas, and majority of them confirm positive attitude to neighbours - 88.1% believe relationships are either neutral or friendly). Young people are better prepared to participate in peaceful dialogues, have greater understanding of conflict risks. According to project data, young people (over 500) in TJ after capacity building have increased their self-esteem by 35%; negotiation skills by 45%; and peace building competencies by 35%. There are 5 women-led households in TJ sustainably operating women livelihoods projects in TJ, which reduce the need for shuttle migration to KG (and thereby reducing grievances and risks from possible unfriendly conduct of border guards).

In a few sentences, explain how the project has made **real human impact**, that is, how did it affect the lives of any people in the country – where possible, use direct quotes that PBSO can use in public communications to highlight the project (1500 character limit):

Quote of Mr. Oqiljon Tohirov, young entrepreneur, residents of jamoat Ovchikalcha (TJ): We received a lot from the project, the things which are invaluable. Looking back, I can say that project made me an active member of my community. Now I’m not more indifferent for the processes going in my village and actively engaged into the decision-making process in my village.

Akmaliddin Khomidov, a resident of Khistevarz jamoat, young entrepreneur: “A study tour organized by UNDP Tajikistan to the promoted youth-led business organizations of Tajikistan gave me a powerful incentive to build my small business. I saw real results and success that are possible to achieve in Tajikistan. I started believing in myself and expand my business which allowed to create two more job places and enlarge service area. Now I have more clients and almost half of them are residents of neighboring Kyrgyz village.”

Majority of women activists increased their capacity in peacebuilding efforts, through access to facilities and resources to voice the concerns and recommendations in decision-making. «I have observed changes in women from our group. Besides attending SHG meetings, they started participating in community activities. We realized the importance of participation in decision making processes within our families, our communities and even country, because we can also contribute to resolving our own problems” said Dobutova Gulayim from Arka village, Janyjer municipality (KG).

If the project progress assessment is **on-track**, please explain what the key **challenges** (if any) have been and which measures were taken to address them (1500 character limit).

On-track

The deterioration of situation in border areas (high tensions) required revision of some activities under Output 1.2, delayed implementation of UNDP, WFP and FAO activities in the project. Therefore, the project requested a grace period to meet project commitments by some Agencies. The grace period is critical to ensure sufficient time to finalize planned activities (including purchase and non-risky infrastructure interventions). As advised by PBF the procurement activities will also be endorsed by the government of TJ - expected in the beginning of December 2019, although the approval process may be longer (already endorsed by Gov. of KG).

KG Government approved the work plan for infrastructure activities in areas away from direct proximity to border areas to generate peacebuilding dividends and reducing risks associated with the infrastructure interventions. Purchase of equipment by UNDP was recommended by local authorities of Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan. Pastures will remain an area of intervention in Tajikistan, implemented with special sensitivity considerations (not as a cross-border activity; also far away from the border). Due to lack of SOPs, WFP TJ will use the remaining food items for the school feeding programme in bordering clusters (and will not implement infrastructure due to sensitivities on TJ side). FAO TJ will ensure the procurement for pastures within agreed grace period (by end November 2019).

If the assessment is **off-track**, please list main reasons/ **challenges** and explain what impact this has had/will have on project duration or strategy and what **measures** have been taken/ will be taken to address the challenges/ rectify project progress (1500 character limit):

CONTINUATION OF THE TEXT DUE TO INSUFFICIENT SPACE ABOVE:

Subject to approval by national Governments on both sides, UNDP plans to address the acute needs of border communities through purchase of equipment for schools, local authorities, and Youth Contact Groups that will enable the use of these venues as dialogue platforms between local authorities and communities to increase tolerance and trust. For proper and timely implementation of all planned interventions, approved by the governments on both sides and agreed with PBSO, it is recommended to consider a grace period at least until 31 December 2019 (with possibility of raising POs within this period).

Please attach as a separate document(s) any materials highlighting or providing more evidence for project progress (for example: publications, photos, videos, monitoring reports, evaluation reports etc.). List below what has been attached to the report, including purpose and audience.

1. Training module on Gender-responsive budgeting and planning, designing for LSG representatives to develop gender-responsive local development plans.

2. Assessment of outcomes of the peacebuilding competencies programme by UNICEF.

3. List of publications related to the project (UNICEF)

4. List of facebook publications - links (UNDP)

5. Photos and screenshots of communication materials by WFP KG (10 photos including screenshots)

6. Success story and profile of recipient by WFP KG (2 files)

7. Photos of community activities implemented by FAO (3 photos)

8. Quotes and photos by UN Women

* 1. **Result progress by project outcome**

*The space in the template allows for up to four project outcomes. If your project has more approved outcomes, contact PBSO for template modification.*

**Outcome 1:** Cooperation and trust between communities increased to mitigate risks of renewed violence

**Rate the current status of the outcome progress:**

**Progress summary:** *Describe main progress under this Outcome made during the reporting period (for June reports: January-June; for November reports: January-November; for final reports: full project duration), including major output progress (not all individual activities). If the project is starting to make/ has made a difference at the outcome level, provide specific evidence for the progress (quantitative and qualitative) and explain how it impacts the broader political and peacebuilding context. Where possible, provide specific examples of change the project has supported/ contributed to as well as, where available and relevant, quotes from partners or beneficiaries about the project and their experience. (3000 character limit)?*

TJ:

Under Output 1 the project has improved linkages between security providers, local authorities and citizens by creating establishing a viable legal support and complaint mechanism for citizens to ensure people-friendly services (legal consultations to 1818 residents, 78 complaints on border issues registered, 3 submitted to Border Service of RT). Project prevented grievances of people, and improved their knowledge on border crossing by public awareness campaign (600 copies recommendations of Border Service on living in non-demarcated border area distributed; numerous meetings held, trainings to border guards on children rights conducted, handbook revised etc). 1500 students and PTA members of 30 schools improved their knowledge on cross-border crossing rules and their competencies on peace building.

Under Output 2 project improved water management and confidence between communities (capacity building of 9 WUAs on water management and planning, and CB training delivered to 867 water users (20%). Trust and confidence of border area residents was enhanced (thereby reducing conflict risk) through youth conference on business &innovations, 21 business ideas developed. To reduce grievances coming from shuttle migration, project supported 58 women economic initiatives, 66 women received food for training support,7 women presented practical experiences on developing own business in KG-TJ joint workshop.

To break stereotypes and entrenched positions of key stakeholders, the project supported a visit of activists to the east TJ (also bordering with KG but having no conflicts) to show peaceful model of coexistence with KG residents, and define possible peacebuilding solutions.

The project contributes to efficient use of water resources (and contributes to reducing livelihoods-based grievances) - 673 people were trained in greenhouses-based agriculture techniques to increase yields, rationalizing water use, and opening up alternative market channels to vulnerable households.

UN TJ supported 33,131 school children through its School Meals Programme.

UN KG and UN TJ fostered trust-building among youth through engaging 707 unemployed and unskilled young women and men in short-term vocational training programs on agricultural and practical skills followed by the Business for Peace Workshop, which acted as a platform for participation and interaction of youths from KG and TJ.

**Outcome 2:** CONTINUATION OF THE OUTCOME 1 TEXT DUE TO INSUFFICIENT SPACE:

KG

Under Output 1 the project conducted regular monitoring of cross-border situation. The data has been shared with authorities at local and national level to ensure early response and mitigation of emerging risks. In the period from January to October 31, 2019, local governments, law enforcement agencies and other state bodies, together with State agency on LSG and inter-ethnic relations public receptions, carried out more than 40 activities of a general preventive nature to prevent emerging and/or occurred conflicts/incidents such as crowds at the borders and physical fighting, minor incidents (e.g. beatings, oral arguments), fights and disturbances in the communities, damages to property, road and water blockages, demonstrations to appeal to own authorities, blockage of works, border guards/military disputes and others. As a result, those conflicts and incidents were localised/limited, to avoid further deepening of conflicts/incidents. Shouldn’t the local governments have undertaken those preventive measures, the scope of conflicts would be further broadened/deteriorated.

Under Output 2 project contributed to addressing one of the key risk factors related to natural resource management through strengthening capacities of WUA by installation of software on water management and planning, training of staff, awareness raising including for water uses. Capacities of farmers & communities strengthened to use of drip irrigation systems at demo-sites. Trainings conducted for 134 border residents (46% women), 36 youth, 12 farmers from TJ.UN Kyrgyzstan supported 225 beneficiaries from vulnerable families to rehabilitate the internal irrigation canals, construct new drinking water systems and protect river banks. WFP Kyrgyzstan purchased wheat grain from local farmers to support market access for local producers. This was then milled, fortified and distributed to these projects.

The role of youth as agents of positive change in their communities has been strengthened through UPSHIFT social innovation programme covered 700 adolescents & youth and improvement of media literacy skills 319 young people (183 women) living at border villages of Leilek and Batken districts.

The project mainstreamed women empowerment through all community activities to ensure their part in decision-making processes. Over 400 participants mainly women & girls took part in the discussions of issues on the role of women and girls in peacebuilding and conflict prevention. LSGs developed gender-responsive Local Development Plans for 2020, integrating peacebuilding activities, and those addressing specific needs of women & girls. 30 representatives of LSGs (9 women), strengthened their knowledge in gender-sensitive planning & budgeting and e-governance tool "Aimak". The trust building and cooperation have been promoted through 36 SHGs mobilised 200 women to strengthen their knowledge on efficient natural resource management including land & water resources, green entrepreneurship, and women’s role and participation in peace and security. Out of 36 SHGs outreached, 22 SHGs prepared their Plans for small-scale peacebuilding initiatives (SSI). Members of 17 SHGs implemented GEWE related SSIs. The local farmers, trained by FAO specialists demonstrated full operation of drip irrigation system & provided consultation. The training became a part of synergies btw 2 agencies.

**Rate the current status of the outcome progress:**

**Progress summary:** *(see guiding questions under Outcome 1)*

**Outcome 3:** n/a

**Rate the current status of the outcome progress:**

**Progress summary:** *(see guiding questions under Outcome 1)*

**Outcome 4:** n/a

**Rate the current status of the outcome progress:**

**Progress summary:** *(see guiding questions under Outcome 1)*

* 1. **Cross-cutting issues**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **National ownership:** How has the national government demonstrated ownership/ commitment to the project results and activities? Give specific examples. (1500 character limit) | The national ownership is ensured through several mechanisms. At national level, the project strategy and its workplan are approved by the multiagency Steering Committee (led by the Government and co-chaired by the UNRC), representing wide range of state and non-state institutions. The Government participates in selection of project sites and implementation of activities, as well as in both countries closely monitors the project progress and results. The focal points in the Government are being consulted and informed about project status on a regular basis.Committee of Women and Family Affairs expressed the willingness and commitment to develop the 2nd NAP 1325 for 2019-2022. Supported organization of the Republican Forum "Improving the political and legal literacy of women and girls - a factor in the development of social stability" with important key message on political role of women and girls in peace building initiatives (400 participants, mainly women, took part in discussions.) The plan is fueled by the practical recommendations and existent lessons learnt of women leaders and activists who actively participated in the process of conflict resolution. The project aligns itself to various government strategies and action plans, including e.g. National Development Strategy, Water Strategies, Youth Strategies etc. The Government acknowledges the unique methodology of project implementation and its conflict-prevention focus. |
| **Monitoring:** Is the project M&E plan on track? What monitoring methods and sources of evidence are being/ have been used? Please attach any monitoring-related reports for the reporting period. *(1500 character limit)?*  | The detailed M&E plan for Phase 2 has been discussed and drafted during the Coordination meeting on 16-17 May 2018 - to ensure coherence of data collection and monitoring (a continuation of Phase 1 approach). UNDP continues monitoring of situation in target areas through its field monitors. UNICEF TJ has developed internal monitoring system to track project results at activity and output levels. The data collected through this system will contribute to the larger project M&E system. WFP has used the Conflict-Sensitivity, Gender and Environmental Risk Screening Checklist to address the recommendations of the Lesson Learned Exercise. The purpose of the checklist is to enhance positive peacebuilding, gender and environmental opportunities as well as ensure that adverse risks and impacts are avoided, minimized, and mitigated in WFP interventions. The data for WFP Checklist will be collected using mobile tools.The government participate in monitoring of the project progress - visit in Tajikistan was held in September 2018, and another one planned in end 2019 (in TJ). The monitoring team from the government includes representatives of MFA and several other Agencies involved into the project.  |
| **Evaluation:** Provide an update on the preparations for the external evaluation for the project, especially if within last 6 months of implementation or final report. Confirm available budget for evaluation. *(1500 character limit)* | In the end of first phase of project the midline survey was conducted on both side of border to analyse changes in people's beliefs, trust and perception of neighbours. The report in TJ showed remaining positive attitudes towards KG residents (between 69 to 81% - in clusters - had positive attitudes toward neighbours, and only 5.9% believe relationships will get worse), but at the same time the social distance between KG and TJ residents increased, including youth. This social distance increase may be explained by limited contacts between communities and recurrent conflict incidents in border areas.External evaluation in the form of Lessons Learnt Exercise was conducted by an International Consultant from Peace Nexus in October-November 2017. The LLE reconfirmed relevance of the project as a whole, as well as relevance of outputs and approaches, providing a set of the recommendations. The report was shared with PBSO. The second phase of the project integrates both recommendations of the LLE exercise (e.g. clearer 'strategies' linking outputs and activities), as well as mid-line survey (e.g. greater attention to youth-focused activities; activities aimed at breaking stereotypes about the neighbours). |
| **Catalytic effects (financial):** Did the project lead to any specific non-PBF funding commitments? If yes, from whom and how much? If not, have any specific attempts been made to attract additional financial contributions to the project and beyond? *(1500 character limit)* | UNDP is negotiating the new intervention with SDC to address natural resource management issues in border areas through conflict-sensitive and human-rights based approach. The SDC scoping mission to project site was conducted in the end of June 2019. SDC is interested in the long-term program with evident development impact on the life of cross-border communities. |
| **Catalytic effects (non-financial):** Did the project create favourable conditions for additional peacebuilding activities by Government/ other donors? If yes, please specify. *(1500 character limit)* | The government start independently allocating resources to tasks covered by the project. For example, projects on streets lighting, concreting inland water canals, sports and cultural events between border communities independently carried out by the efforts of the local communities themselves. Governments also conduct trust-building activities (e.g. joint sport events, cultural events). Several Youth Contact Groups and women's social initiatives supported in Phase 1 continue activities independently, moreover the local capacity built by the project is actively engaging by the other projects and organizations running in the target area. At Kyrgyz side the Youth Contact Groups have been insitutionalized and implement peacebuilding initiatives in respective communities with support of other donors. Some of active young people became mentors and trainers on youth activization and skills learning within the UNDP TJ projects. Peacebuilding competency curriculum that has been developed within the PBF project has a potential for catalytic effect for broader competency building among adolescents and youth in the country with the focus on peacebuilding.  |
| **Exit strategy/ sustainability:** What steps have been taken to prepare for end of project and help ensure sustainability of the project results beyond PBF support for this project? *(1500 character limit)* | Sustainability of the project is ensured both through embedding approaches and results in operation of state institutions (e.g. of youth centres, local women committees), as well as working with communities to change approaches, new ways of thinking about solving local issues around the border. These new approaches include the do-no-harm approach and considering the conflict sensitivities by authorities themselves while undertaking actions near the border; understanding of the need of proactive activities to create 'platforms of meetings' of KG and TJ neighbours (local authorities organize them now without UN support) The project emphasizes creating durable changes in competencies and attitudes of people, especially young people - UNICEF study showed that peacebuilding competencies, negotiations and self-esteem competencies has increase from 3.1-3.4 to 4.4-4.5 as a result of capacity building.In addition, the project established a Regional Association of women peacebuilders to network and collaborate by exchange of knowledge and experience on women's empowerment in peacebuilding. Similarly, the work with WUAs establishes the framework for sustainably more efficient water management in border areas.  |
| **Risk taking:** Describe how the project has responded to risks that threatened the achievement of results. Identify any new risks that have emerged since the last report. *(1500 character limit)* | The project has designed Standard Operating Procedures on implementation of infrastructure projects, which ensures confidence building between neighbouring communities, includes e.g. consultations at community level, exchange of technical specifications of projects etc. Mirroring principle of the project is another key mechanism to prevent risks of conflict during implementation (to avoid imbalance in results) UN addressed risks by maintaining dialogue with the government of KG and TJ e.g. through high level visits (eg. UNDP Deputy Regional Director), and high-level meetings in New York. UNDP hired an independent engineer who conducted visits to both sides to measure water levels in contentious irrigation canal case, and helped provide a pathways on risks mitigation in future irrigation construction activities. Both UN teams (in KG and TJ) set up a monitoring and tracking mechanism - with higher frequency of reporting than TRACTION.The project continues monitoring of conflict risks through TRACTION. The intensity and participation of law enforcement in incidents creates higher risks of further escalation. In March 2019 an incident occurred between Vorukh and Aksay residents with the involvement of Border guards on which 2 people were killed. The recent conflict incident on September 2019 was caused by and between the militaries and resulted in 4 servicemen killed. The agreement made by sides didn't content parties entirely and left the level of tension considerably high.  |
| **Gender equality:** In the reporting period, which activities have taken place with a specific focus on addressing issues of gender equality or women’s empowerment? *(1500 character limit)* | During the Coordination meeting on 20-21 November 2018, the Gender Mainstreaming Stategy of the project endorsed, outlining specific measures RUNOs should introduce to ensure embedding of gender mainstreaming mechanisms in all cycles of the project implementation. In KG 36 SHGs were created to empower over 210 women & train them on sustainable & green entrepreneurship & efficient natural resource management. The situation analysis aimed at learning attitudes & practices of women across SHGs on beliefs towards GEWE issues, women’s participation in public life, the role of women in peacebuilding &economic empowerment. Within the FFT modality, a set of short-term trainings were organized to support rural women and girls, for capacity building and promotion the opportunities for self-employment, creating income-generating source and to reveal their creative potential. 572 women and girls have benefitted from the capacity building trainings and courses.The FFT assistance is considered as an investment in supporting women’s life condition and rights, testing a more focused and better-resourced income-generating activities for catalysing and sustaining gender equality efforts. Specific trainings were provided for women leaders to increase their knowledge and potential to serve as advocates and to promote rights and interests of women and girls in communities. They carried out local actions to coincide with the theme of 16 Days of Activism to to stop VAW. |
| **Other:** Are there any other issues concerning project implementation that you want to share, including any capacity needs of the recipient organizations? *(1500 character limit)* |       |

**1.3 INDICATOR BASED PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT*:*** *Using the* ***Project Results Framework as per the approved project document or any amendments****- provide an update on the achievement of* ***key indicators*** *at both the outcome and output level in the table below (if your project has more indicators than provided in the table, select the most relevant ones with most relevant progress to highlight). Where it has not been possible to collect data on indicators, state this and provide any explanation.* Provide gender and age disaggregated data. (300 characters max per entry)

|  | **Performance Indicators** | **Indicator Baseline** | **End of project Indicator Target** | **Current indicator progress** | **Reasons for Variance/ Delay****(if any)** | **Adjustment of target (if any)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Outcome 1**Cooperation and trust between communities increased to mitigate risks of renewed violence | Indicator 1.1a: % of community members from the 6 pilot village clusters who indicate an improvement in cross-border relations/cooperation with community members in the same village cluster on the other side of the border (disaggregated by gender, age, villa | a) 35% of respondents described their relations with neighbors as bad/open conflict.b) 60% of respondents think that relations will not be improved (data disaggregated by nationality, gender and age is available) | 10% increase over baseline | KG: score 4.5/5 (scales: 1-open conflict; 5-close cooperation) = 90%TJ: a) 25.5% increase:87.6% of respondents described their relations as neutral or friendly (BS:62.15%)b) 19% increase - 68.4% of respondents indicated that relations are good and will improve quickly/slowly (BS:49.3%) |  |  |
| Indicator 1.2b: # of violent incidents in pilot cluster is decreased | Kyrgyz Republic – 32 in 2015Republic of Tajikistan - 26 incident cases in 2015  | 20% decrease over baseline  | 31 incidents reported for Jan- Nov 10, 2019 - 9% decreasein compare with the same period of 2015(uniform 2015 baseline based on TRACTION) |  |  |
| Indicator 1.3c: % of community members from the 6 pilot cross-border village clusters who would be ready to work together with community members in the same village cluster on the other side of the border to improve the lives of cross-border communities o n both  | 37% of respondents do not want even to work with the neighbors and 74% do not accept keenship relations (data disaggregated by nationality, gender and age is available) | 10% increase over baseline | 49% of respondents in KG and 88.3% in RT who are fully or partially willing to cooperate with representatives of the neighboring village to resolve personal or social problems. |  |  |
| Output 1.1Improved linkages and cooperation between security providers, local authorities and communities to reduce violent incidents  | Indicator 1.1.1Number of interventions/ activities/ preventive actions that were implemented by security providers, local authorities and communities on one side of the border in the 6 pilot cross-border village clusters to improve information exchange and pr | 94 events in KG and TJ (in the Phase 1 by December 2017; the target was 8) | At least 20 (10 in TJ and 10 in KG) interventions/ activities/ preventive actions that were jointly implemented by security providers, local authorities and communities on one side of the border in the 6 pilot cross-border village clusters to improve information exchange and prevent security incide | 2 events at district and 5 at jamoat level are conducted in Tajikistan. More than 900 students and 600 PTA members of 30 schools in B. Gafurov and Isfara improved their knowledge on cross-border crossing rules and their competencies on peace building.  |  |  |
| Indicator 1.1.21.1.3 Number of problem solving and complaints mechanisms – PSCM, (either cross-border or on one side of the border) established/improved that bring security providers, local authorities and communities together to address community grievances and re | 4 (2 in each country) (by December 2017)  | Maintain and improve 4 existing problem solving and complaints mechanisms - 2 in TJ and 2 in KG (either cross-border or on one side of the border) | 2 mechanisms established within the 1st phase of project in TJ are functioning. In 2019Office of Ombudsman in RT registered 78 grievances of border residents.Through partnership with CSO "Legal initiative" and Ombudsman office complaint mechanism is improved and awareness raised about it.  |  |  |
| Output 1.2Communities restore cross-border linkages and trust by jointly addressing interdependent needs/ challenges associated with community infrastructure and natural resources, as well as by establishing platforms of confidence-building and cooperation between various societal groups | Indicator 1.2.1Number of projects that were agreed by communities from both sides of the pilot cross-border village clusters and to address interdependent needs/ challenges associated with community infrastructure (with information on how many of those were i | 83 \* projects implemented in RT and KR, according to AR (\*projects financed both by IRF and SDC) | 20 projects (10 TJ, 10 KG) jointly agreed/implemented by communities from both sides  | 0Priority needs and projects are identified on each side, the national Governemnt decision is pending on Tajik side, to endorse purchase of euqipment instead of infrastructure.  |  |  |
| Indicator 1.2.2Number of youth (disaggregated data for young men/ boys and young women/ girls) that benefitted from training/ support or participated in; a) cross-border joint youth events, and b) in-country youth events that aim to promote inter-ethnic toler | a) 7,293 b) 7,311 | a) 1000 (500 from TJ and 500 from KG) b) 800 (400 from TJ and 400 from KG) (segregated data for young men/ boys and young women/ girls) that benefitted from training/ support or participated in joint cross-border youth events in pilot cross-border village clusters | TJ: a) 50 adolescents from TJ; b) 833 (627 youth and 206 adolescents).In addition, about 700 adolescents improved their skills for 21st century through UPSHIFT social innovation programme;KG: a) 100 young people from KG overall 345 young people have participated in joint trainings.  |  |  |
| Output 1.3 | Indicator 1.3.1Indicator 1.2.3: Number of joint cross-border initiatives responding to specific gender equality and women’s empowerment (GEWE) issues are implemented by women activists  |  7 social and business initiatives | At least 4 cross-border women’s initiatives (small projects) implemented by women | 5 women-led small-scale business initiatives to improve economic security of vulnerable women in four village clusters of TJ (58 women targeted), 17 small-scale initiatives in six village clusters of KG (80 women targeted)”.  |  |  |
| Indicator 1.3.2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Outcome 2** | Indicator 2.1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Indicator 2.2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Indicator 2.3 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Output 2.1 | Indicator 2.1.1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Indicator 2.1.2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Output 2.2 | Indicator 2.2.1 |  |  |  |   |  |
| Indicator 2.2.2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Output 2.3 | Indicator 2.3.1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Indicator 2.3.2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Outcome 3** | Indicator 3.1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Indicator 3.2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Indicator 3.3 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Output 3.1 | Indicator 3.1.1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Indicator 3.1.2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Output 3.2 | Indicator 3.2.1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Indicator 3.2.2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Output 3.3 | Indicator 3.3.1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Indicator 3.3.2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Outcome 4** | Indicator 4.1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Indicator 4.2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Indicator 4.3 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Output 4.1 | Indicator 4.1.1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Indicator 4.1.2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Output 4.2 | Indicator 4.2.1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Indicator 4.2.2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Output 4.3 | Indicator 4.3.1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Indicator 4.3.2 |  |  |  |  |  |

**PART 2: INDICATIVE PROJECT FINANCIAL PROGRESS**

* 1. **Comments on the overall state of financial expenditures**

Please rate whether project financial expenditures are on track, delayed, or off track, vis-à-vis project plans and by recipient organization:

How many project budget tranches have been received to date and what is the overall level of expenditure against the total budget and against the tranche(s) received so far (500 characters limit):

Budget:

Total received: 2mln$ Expenditure: $996,720 (50%)

TJ: received $1,000,000.00 Expenditure: $752,385 (75%)

KG: received $1,000,000 Expenditure: expenditure: $460,675 (46%)

When do you expect to seek the next tranche, if any tranches are outstanding:

N/a

If expenditure is delayed or off track, please provide a brief explanation (500 characters limit):

Please state what $ amount was planned (in the project document) to be allocated to activities focussed on gender equality or women’s empowerment and how much has been actually allocated to date: In project document, up to 30% of project budget is aimed to be allocated for gender mainstreaming activities, following the guidliness of the PBSO. To date, the TJ UN Women spent $100,000 (100% from the initially planned amount), KG UN Women spent $140,000 (100% of the budget).

Please fill out and attach Annex A on project financial progress **with detail on expenditures/ commitments to date using the original project budget table in Excel**, even though the $ amounts are indicative only.

1. Note: commencement date will be the date of first funds transfer. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Maximum project duration for IRF projects is 18 months, for PRF projects – 36 months. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)